Case 2:08-cv-02987-RGK-SH Document 124 Filed 07/31/09 Page 1 of 2

```
Alan E. Wisotsky (SBN 68051)
   Dirk DeGenna (SBN 188972)
   LAW OFFICES OF ALAN E. WISOTSKY
   300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 1500
   Oxnard, California 93036
             (805) 278-0920
   Tel:
             (805) 278-0289
 4
    Fax:
   E-mail: lawyers@wisotskylaw.com
 5
   Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF OXNARD,
   OXNARD POLICE DEPARTMENT, JOHN CROMBACH,
   and ANDREW SALINAS
 7
 8
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                     CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
   MARIA LAZOS, et al.,
                                        No. CV 08-02987 RGK (SHx)
12
             Plaintiffs,
                                        [consolidated w/
                                        No. CV 08-05153 RGK (SH)]
13
        V.
                                        DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO
   CITY OF OXNARD, et al.,
                                        PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
14
                                        DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN
15
                                        LIMINE No. 3 TO PRECLUDE
             Defendants.
                                        EVIDENCE AND/OR ARGUMENT RE
                                        LESSER INTRUSIVE FORCE
16
17
                                        [Motion in Limine No. 3]
   AND CONSOLIDATED ACTION.
18
                                        Date : August 11, 2009
                                        Time: 9:00 a.m.
19
                                        Ctrm: 850 Roybal
20
21
22
         Defendants hereby submit the following reply to Plaintiff's
2.3
   Opposition to Third Motion in Limine.
24
        The Defendants' Third Motion in Limine was to preclude
25
   evidence and/or argument regarding the use of lesser intrusive
2.6
   force. Defendants provided overwhelming case law from the Ninth
27
   Circuit as well as other Circuits supporting the position that the
   Fourth Amendment does not require officers to use the most
28
```

Case 2:08-cv-02987-RGK-SH Document 124 Filed 07/31/09 Page 2 of 2

reasonable means of effecting a search or seizure, only that the means used be reasonable. The issue is not whether there were less intrusive alternatives available — that is, more effective and less painful ones — but whether the techniques used were or were not excessive force. As such, evidence and/or arguments of lesser intrusive force are not relevant or admissible.

Plaintiffs cite no less than 13 cases in their opposition, however, not a single one addresses the issue raised by this motion, let alone contradict defendants' position. Additionally, plaintiffs completely mislead the court with their rendition of how the incident occurred, it is unsupported by the evidence.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and authorities, it is respectfully requested that the Court grant this in limine motion and preclude plaintiff from arguing and/or presenting evidence regarding the use of lesser intrusive force.

18 Dated: July , 2009

LAW OFFICES OF ALAN E. WISOTSKY

21 By:

DIRK DeGENNA
Attorneys for Defendants,
CITY OF OXNARD, OXNARD POLICE
DEPARTMENT, JOHN CROMBACH, and
ANDREW SALINAS